

Appl. No. 10/659,100
Atty. Docket No. 9031
Amdt. dated March 07, 2008
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 07, 2007
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 7-10 and 19-32 are pending in this application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claim 6 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 8-10 have been amended. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, in the specification at page 3, lines 20-30; page 4, lines 1-6; page 4, lines 10-23; page 6, lines 15-16; and page 8, lines 15-17.

Claims 19-32 have been added. Support for the addition of these claims can be found, for example, in the specification at pages 7-9, the claims as originally filed, and Figs. 2-7.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

- 1) Claims 6, and 8-10 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,456,745 (Roreger) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,096,328 (Sagel).

Claims 6 and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roreger in view of Sagel. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection and in order to advance prosecution, claim 6, from which claims 8-10 depend, has been cancelled and claims 8-10 now depend from new independent claim 19 thereby mooting this rejection.

Appl. No. 10/659,100
Atty. Docket No. 9031
Amdt. dated March 07, 2008
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 07, 2007
Customer No. 27752

2) Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious under U.S. Patent No. 5,456,745 Roreger in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,096,328 (Sagel) further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,146,655 (Ruben).

Claims 7 has been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roreger in view of Sagel further in view of Ruben. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection and in order to advance prosecution, claim 6, from which claim 7 depends, has been cancelled and claim 7 now depends from new independent claim 19 thereby mooting this rejection.

3) Patentability of Newly Added Claims 19-32

Applicants believe that newly added claims 19-32 and claims 7-10 which depend from new claim 19 are novel and nonobvious over Roreger, Sagel, and Ruben in that none of these references teach: a mesh comprising a plurality of fibers arranged to define a plurality of void spaces between the fibers (independent claims 19, 23, and 28); the plurality of void spaces in the mesh extends through the thickness of the film (claim 19); a mesh having a first and second side and comprising a plurality of coated fibers, the coated fibers arranged to provide a plurality of void spaces that extend from the first side of the mesh to the second side of the mesh (claim 28); and the plurality of fibers comprise a second water hydratable polymer (claim 23). Therefore, Applicants assert that independent claims 19, 23, and 28 and those claims dependent thereon are allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that this represents a complete response. Early and favorable action in this case is respectfully requested. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and allowance of all of the claims.

Appl. No. 10/659,100
Atty. Docket No. 9031
Amdt. dated March 07, 2008
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 07, 2007
Customer No. 27752

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By Carrie M Benjamin
Signature

Carrie M. Benjamin
Registration No. 58,861
(513) 622-1822

Date: March 07, 2008
Customer No. 27752